APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/719,461	11/21/2003	Frederick Lo	CA919990010US2	2591

46320   7590   12/20/2007
CAREY, RODRIGUEZ, GREENBERG & PAUL, LLP
STEVEN M. GREENBERG
950 PENINSULA CORPORATE CIRCLE
SUITE 3020
BOCA RATON, FL 33487

EXAMINER
ZHEN, LI B

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2194	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
12/20/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/719,461	LO ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Li B. Zhen	2194	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>04 October 2007</u>.

2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b) ☒ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) *1-11* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) *1-4, 7-9 and 11* is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) *5, 6 and 10* is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a) ☐ All   b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:

      1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   Claims 5, 6 and 10 are pending in the application.

Claim Objections

2.   Claims 5 and 6 are objected to because of the following informalities:

a.   Claim 5, line 7 "said declarations" lacks antecedent basis;

b.   Claim 5, line 10, "said ERP data" lacks antecedent basis;

c.   Acronyms in the claims: "ERP" (claim 5, line 1), "API" (claim 5, line 2),

"XML" (claim 5, line 4) should be defined;

d.   The limitation "or HyperText Markup Language (HTML) statements"

suggests that the HTML statements are not required to be part of the XML file or

read. However step (b) requires the HTML statements to be parsed. In order to

parse the HTML statements, the HTML statements must be contained in the XML

file and must be read;

e.   Claim 6, line 5 "said Application object identifier" lacks antecedent basis; -

f.   Claim 6, line 8 "said current object" lacks antecedent basis;

g.   Steps (a) – (f) in claim 6 should be renamed to differentiate from the

ordering of steps (a) – (d) in claim 5;

h.   Claim 6, steps (b) – (d) should end with a colon;

i.   Appropriate correction is required.

CLAIM INTERPRETATIONS

3.   The broadest reasonable interpretations of the claims have been afforded that

instant application. The following are interpretations of the claimed invention.

Claim 10, line 2 recites "a computer readable medium for storing statements or

instructions". It is noted that claim 10 recites the intended use of the computer readable

medium (i.e. for storing statements or instructions) and does not require the computer

readable medium to actually store the statements or instructions. Therefore, claim 10 is

interpreted as an article of manufacture comprising a computer readable medium.

Response to Arguments

4.   Applicant's arguments filed 10/04/2007 have been fully considered but they are

not persuasive. In response to the Non-Final Office Action dated July 5, 2007, applicant

argues:

(1) Meltzer does not teach converting ERP data to strongly typed data in Java

objects [p. 5, lines 6 – 16];

(2) The file in Meltzer does not define the Java object being created. Instead,

Meltzer teaches that the file is parsed and then translated [p. 6, lines 23 – 28];

(3) Meltzer does not teach "populating said objects with data from said ERP

data" because the objects being populated with data are the objects that are

defined by the original document. [p. 7, lines 1 – 6].

As to argument (1), examiner respectfully disagrees and submits it is inherent

that Java objects are strongly typed because Java is a strongly typed object-oriented

language [see "The Java Language Specification Introduction," cited in PTO Form 892

attached with this office action]. Meltzer teaches converting XML instances to and from the corresponding Java object [col. 32, lines 1 – 13]. Therefore, the Java objects in Meltzer are also strongly typed.

As to argument (2), examiner disagrees and notes that Meltzer teaches elements and attributes of the document are translated into the format of the host. Specifically, XML logic structures are translated into JAVA objects [col. 26, lines 11 – 40]. Therefore, the Java objects in Meltzer are based on the elements and attributes (XML logic structures) of the document. In addition, it is noted that claim 5 does not require creating objects based on definitions. For example, step (a) recites "reading an XML file containing said definition of said Java objects", step (b) recites "parsing each of said declarations and HTML statements to identify definitions of objects" and step (c) recites "creating said respective objects with their attributes". Claim 5 only recites creating the objects with their attributes and does not require creating objects based upon the definitions found in the XML file. In addition, Meltzer teaches creating Java objects based on XML document type definition [The parser uses the purchase order DTD to decompose the purchase order instance into a stream of information about the elements and attribute values it contains. These "property sets" are then transformed into corresponding JAVA event objects by wrapping them with JAVA code; col. 81, lines 23 – 65]. The XML document type definition contains the definition and attributes for the Java objects.

As to argument (3), examiner disagrees and notes that the objects in Meltzer are defined by the original document [see response to argument (2) above].

The arguments with regards to claim 6 are moot in view of the new grounds of

rejection for claim 6.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

6.   **Claims 5 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by**

U.S. Patent No. 6,125,391 to Meltzer et al. [hereinafter Meltzer, previously cited].

7.   As to claim 5, Meltzer teaches a method of converting ERP data in a database [a

database 706; col. 29, lines 25 – 53] managed by an ERP application [enterprise

functions; col. 23, line 63 – col. 24, line 54] and accessed through an ERP API and ERP

Message Agent API (MAAPI) [ESIS listener API; col. 27, lines 8 – 25] to strongly typed

data in Java objects [converting XML instances to and from the corresponding JAVA

objects; col. 32, lines 1 – 13] comprising the steps of:

(a) reading a XML file containing said definition of said Java objects and their

attributes [receiving a document at the network interface (step 400); col. 26, lines 18 –

40]; or HyperText Markup Language (HTML) statements which specifies presentation

format;

(b) parsing each of said declarations and HTML statements to identify definitions

of objects and their attributes [parser identifies the document type (401) in response to

the business interface definition....the document is parsed (step 402); col. 26, lines 18 –

40]; and

(c) creating said respective objects with their attributes [XML logic structures are

translated into JAVA objects which carry the data of the XML element as well as

methods associated with the data such as get and set functions; col. 26, lines 18 – 40

and col. 81, lines 23 – 65];

(d) populating said objects with data from said ERP data [output data of the

service is produced (step 1207). The output is converted to the document format, for

example from a JAVA format; col. 83, lines 28 – 45].

8.   As to claim 10, Meltzer teaches an article of manufacture for use in a computer

system comprising a computer readable medium for storing statements or instructions

for use in execution in a computer in accordance with the method of any of claims 5 or 6

[col. 5, lines 40 – 56].

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

9.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

10.   **Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over**

Meltzer in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,738,975 to Yee et al. [hereinafter Yee].

11.   As to claim 6, Meltzer teaches setting said Application object identifier [col. 82,

lines 26 – 60], username [col. 9, line 55 – col. 10, line 29] and password using said

MAAPI [col. 12, lines 5 – 23], setting search key values, instructing said ERP application

to process said current object [col. 30, lines 36 – 53] and for every scroll level creating a

corresponding object and setting its attributes with data from said ERP Application data

[col. 11, line 10 – col. 12, line 5]. Meltzer does not teach opening a connection through

said ERP API to said ERP Message Agent API (MAAPI) and closing said connection to

said ERP API [col. 84, lines 15 – 34].

However, Yee teaches an enterprise integration system [col. 13, line 57 – col. 14,

line 11], opening a connection [col. 7, lines 26 – 32] through a ERP API [API 310; col.

16, lines 53 – 65] to the ERP Message Agent API [agent-adapter 200; col. 16, lines 52 –

65] and closing the connection to the ERP API [col. 29, lines 40 – 46].

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to modify the invention of Meltzer to include the features of an

enterprise integration system, opening a connection through an ERP API to the ERP

Message Agent API and closing the connection to the ERP API. One of ordinary skill in

the art would have been motivated to make the combination because this provides a

strong agent-adapter architecture for integrating disparate enterprise applications [col.

14, lines 20 – 30 of Yee].

CONTACT INFORMATION

12.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Li B. Zhen whose telephone number is (571) 272-3768. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon - Fri, 8:30am - 5pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, William Thomson can be reached on 571-272-3718. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Li B. Zhen
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2194

lbz